



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,920	11/06/2001	David W. Boreham	13220.006001; P5841	5466

32615 7590 08/22/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN  
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,920

Applicant(s)

BOREHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas R. Taylor

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

P

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Because new grounds of rejection are being applied against substantively unamended claims, this action is NON-FINAL.

2. Claims 1-13 and 24 have been examined and are rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/2005 with respect to claims 1-13 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informality: Grammar error, "...wherein at least of the plurality of ...". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2141

6. Claims 1-7, 10-12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weider et al. (US Patent 6,490,589) and Willie et al. (US Patent 6,052,724.)

7. As per claims 1, 6, and 24, Weider teaches a method of generating a value of a virtual attribute, comprising:

receiving a request for the value of the virtual attribute from a client; and

servicing the request by the one of the plurality of virtual attribute services providers to obtain the value of the virtual attribute (Weider, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 45.)

However, Weider teaches wherein the requests are sent directly to the client, and not:

forwarding the request from the virtual attribute service to one of a plurality of virtual attribute services providers;

receiving the value of the virtual attribute by the virtual attribute service from the one of the plurality of virtual attribute service providers; and

forwarding the value of the virtual attribute to the client.

Willie teaches a directory service that forwards requests to service providers and returns the result to the request device (Willie, column 5, line 61 to column 6, line 29 and column 7, line 56 to column 8, line 23.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Weider and Willie to provide the service system of Willie in the system of Weider, because

Art Unit: 2141

doing so would help manage a complex directory service and simply the interface with the service (Willie, column 4, lines 34-41.)

8. As per claim 2, Weider-Willie teaches the system further wherein the attribute value is not physically contained within the entry (Weider, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 45.)

9. As per claims 3 and 10, Weider-Willie teaches the system further wherein at least one of the plurality of virtual attribute service providers comprises a role service (Weider, column 9, lines 17-14, wherein the virtual attribute is calculated based on role.)

10. As per claims 4 and 11, Weider-Willie teaches the system further wherein at least one of the plurality of virtual attribute service providers is implemented as a class of service (Weider, column 9, lines 17-14, wherein the virtual attribute is calculated based on class.)

11. As per claims 5 and 12, Weider-Willie teaches the system further wherein at least one of the plurality of virtual attribute service providers is implemented as a plugin to the directory server (Willie, column 21, lines 33-44.)

Art Unit: 2141

12. As per claim 7, Weider-Willie teaches the system further comprising: using a memory cache to store the value of the virtual attribute (Weider, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 45.)

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weider et al. (US Patent 6,490,589) and Willie et al. (US Patent 6,052,724), further in view of Cassidy et al. (US Patent 6,249,883.)

14. As per claim 8, Weider-Willie teaches the above, yet fails to teach further comprising:

maintaining a count for a number of times a query passes through the virtual attribute service; and

flagging an error and aborting the execution of the virtual attribute service if the count exceeds a threshold number.

Cassidy teaches a method of monitoring LDAP and directory services (Cassidy, column 7, lines 10-26) that counts the number of times a query has occurred and flags/aborts if a threshold is exceeded (Cassidy, table 1, AlertTypeLDAPLoadTooHigh and AlertTypePropDroppedSynchHigh.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Weider-Willie and Cassidy to provide the monitoring of Cassidy in the system of Weider-Willie, because doing so would enable improved monitoring services that reduce the risk of unreliable access (Cassidy, column 2, lines 31-36.)

15. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weider et al. (US Patent 6,490,589) and Willie et al. (US Patent 6,052,724), further in view of Trevor et al. (US PGPub 2002/0049761.)

16. As per claim 9, Weider-Willie teaches the above, yet fails to teach further comprising:

checking a configuration change within one of the plurality of virtual attribute service providers against a configuration associated with each of the other plurality of virtual service providers to determine whether a cycle is created; and

flagging an error and aborting the execution of the virtual attribute service if a cycle is created.

Trevor teaches detecting and preventing recursive loops between network elements and responding if a loop is detected (Trevor, Abstract and paragraphs 0014-0015.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Weider-Willie and Trevor to provide the detection system of Trevor in the system of Weider-Willie, because doing so would enable recursive loop prevention in the system (Trevor, Summary.)

17. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weider et al. (US Patent 6,490,589) and Cassidy et al. (US Patent 6,249,883) and Trevor et al. (US PGPub 2002/0049761.)

18. As per claim 13, Weider teaches a method of generating a value of a virtual attribute, comprising:

- calling a virtual attribute service by an executable application;

- consulting a virtual attribute service provider within a common interface of the virtual attribute service;

- using a memory cache to store the value of the virtual attribute; and

- wherein the value of the virtual attribute is generated by the virtual service provider accessed by the common interface (Weider, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 45.)

However, Weider fails to teach:

- maintaining a count for the number of times a query passes through the common interface; and

- flagging an error and aborting the execution of the virtual attribute service if the count exceeds a threshold number.

Cassidy teaches a method of monitoring LDAP and directory services (Cassidy, column 7, lines 10-26) that counts the number of times a query has occurred and flags/aborts if a threshold is exceeded (Cassidy, table 1, AlertTypeLDAPLoadTooHigh and AlertTypePropDroppedSyncHigh.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Weider and Cassidy to provide the monitoring of Cassidy in the system of Weider, because doing so



Art Unit: 2141

would enable improved monitoring services that reduce the risk of unreliable access (Cassidy, column 2, lines 31-36.)

Weider-Cassidy further fails to teach: checking a configuration change within a service provider against the configuration of all service providers;

determining whether a cycle is created; and

flagging an error and aborting the execution of the virtual attribute service if a cycle is created;

Trevor teaches detecting and preventing recursive loops between network elements and responding if a loop is detected (Trevor, Abstract and paragraphs 0014-0015.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Weider-Cassidy and Trevor to provide the detection system of Trevor in the system of Weider-Cassidy, because doing so would enable recursive loop prevention in the system (Trevor, Summary.)

### ***Conclusion***


19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2141



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER